



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/605,010	06/27/2000	Marzio Pozzuoli	57761.000031	3952

7590 04/08/2003

Thomas M Blasey Esq
Hunton & Williams
1900 K Street NW
Suite 120
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

DU, THUAN N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2185

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2003

1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/605,010

Applicant(s)

POZZUOLI ET AL.

Examiner

Thuan N. Du

Art Unit

2185

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

Drawings

2. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admission of prior art [AAPA] and Agranat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,973,696).

5. Regarding claims 1 and 17, AAPA teaches a protective relay for providing protective control to a power system comprising:

a microprocessor [application's specification, p. 1, lines 5-6];

first and second connections to a communication network and the power system,

respectively [application's specification, p. 1, lines 4-7];

Art Unit: 2185

a communication server configured to receive relay configuration commands from a remote computer over the communications network, and to provide power system data and relay status data to the remote computer over the communications network [Fig. 1; application's specification, p. 5, lines 5-8].

AAPA teaches the communication server communicates with remote computer over a communications network using a product-specific software, therefore, the communications capability of the protective relay is limited. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the flexibility of AAPA's device would increase if the device can support standard web browser software. More specifically, AAPA does not teach the communication server communicates with remote computer over a communication network in a network format.

Agranat et al. teach a device with embedded web server for communicating with remote computer over a communication network in a network format (HTTP protocol) [col. 11, lines 1-8].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of AAPA and Agranat et al. because it would increase the flexibility of AAPA's device by allowing the device easily communicates with any remote computer over a communications network in a standard network format.

6. Regarding claims 2-13 and 18-22, claims 2-13 and 18-22 are directed to apparatuses implementing the protective relay IED of claims 1 and 17. As stated above, AAPA and Agranat et al. teach the invention substantially as set forth in claims 1 and 17. At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that AAPA and Agranat et al. may also teach the implementations of claims 1 and 17 as set forth in claims 2-13 and 18-

Art Unit: 2185

22. As such, claims 2-13 and 18-22 are rejected under same rationale with respect to claims 1 and 17.

7. Regarding claims 14-16, since they recite method of operating of the apparatus defined in the apparatus claims, they are rejected accordingly based on the rejection of the apparatus claims.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan N. Du whose telephone number is (703) 308-6292 or via e-mail, **thuan.du@uspto.gov**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 9:00 AM - 5:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas C. Lee can be reached on (703) 305-9717.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

- (703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]
- (703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]
- (703) 746-7240 [Non-Official Communication]

and/or:

Art Unit: 2185

(703) 746-5668 (use this fax number, only after approval by Examiner, for
“INFORMAL” or “DRAFT” communication).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Park II
2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA 22202
Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Thuan N. Du
April 2, 2003



THOMAS LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100